UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } *Associate Editors*

Religion in Modern Life—and Afterwards

By James H. Cousins

Community Politics

An Editorial

By Joseph Ernest McAfee

Other articles and reviews by William Pickens, Lucia Ames Mead, Arthur L. Weatherly, John Haynes Holmes, Robert C. Schaller.

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 3

Chicago, March 20, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 35
Community Politics—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 37
Jottings—J. H. H. 39

ARTICLES—
Religion in Modern Life—and Afterwards—JAMES H. COUSINS .. 40
Fallacy in the Liquor Argument—WILLIAM PICKENS 42
To-day's Money-makers—LUCIA AMES MEAD 43

THE STUDY TABLE—
Power and the Public—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 44
The Peaceful Redskin—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 45
Only Yesterday—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 45

CORRESPONDENCE—
Technocracy in the Balance—CHARLES E. PETTY 46
Inflation—ALFRED B. BLAKE 47

THE FIELD—
In Memory of John Galsworthy—FREDERICK HANKINSON 34
British Churchmen Aroused 48
A Story of Emerson—*The Christian Leader* 48

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

In Memory of John Galsworthy

(Editorial Note.—Our Editorial Correspondent, Frederick Hankinson, writes from Budapest of a meeting held in that city under the auspices of the Hungarian P E N Club, in memory of John Galsworthy. Mr. Hankinson's address at this meeting is printed herewith. In his covering letter, he writes):

"John Galsworthy took a real and vital interest in the conditions of prisons and the welfare of prisoners. Nothing gave him greater pleasure than to hear of the improvements made after the War in those prisons I have visited from time to time in Hungary, Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, and Latvia. On one occasion I knew him to become deeply concerned over the fate of a prisoner quite unknown to him, who he thought was going to be hanged in a foreign prison. Galsworthy wrote personally to the head of the State and later begged me to find out the actual facts of the trial. It was a delight to see his relief and pleasure when he heard that the case had been tried before a civil court and that the prisoner would not be hanged. It was like a benediction to see his kindly smile and to hear his gracious approval of any simple deed one might have done in relieving some of the poverty and misery of the victims of the War in central and eastern Europe. He felt deeply the sorrows and sufferings of the refugees, exiles, homeless and hunger-stricken, who were innocent of the iniquities caused by the War and the peace. He did all he could in secret and quiet ways to alleviate any injustice or wrong, any want or need. There was a humorous side to his character and his hearty laughter revealed the jovial and genial companion. He loved a good joke or story. I treasure a book he sent me. I had lent him a novel by a new author. After reading it, he lost it, and buying a new copy, he wrote my name in it, and then the words, 'From John Galsworthy, with penitence.'"

Address

It is a privilege to be with you, the Hungarian friends of John Galsworthy, today, on this solemn occasion, to add my humble testimony to the sacred memory of a great, good and noble English gentleman, the distinguished and world renowned writer of novels, essays, plays and poems. Others will sing his literary merits, but I merely wish to add a few words about his home life and also his deep and sincere interest in Hungary. While millions of readers in his own beloved homeland and in foreign counties have been delighted and inspired by his written or spoken word, yet those who were honored to know him in his intimate family life in his beautiful London home at Hampstead or in his country Sussex home, will always feel the spiritual touch of the perfect host,

(*Continued on page 47*)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, MARCH 20, 1933 Number 3

It is a sad Reflection, that many Men hardly have any Religion at all; and most Men have none of their own: For that which is the Religion of their Education, and not of their Judgment, is the Religion of Another, and not Theirs.

It were better to be of no Church, than to be bitter for any.

The Humble, Meek, Merciful, Just, Pious, and Devout Souls, are everywhere of one Religion; and when Death has taken off the Mask, they will know one another, tho' the divers Liveries they wear here make them Strangers.

—*William Penn.*

There was an air of tragedy about President Roosevelt's inauguration which not all the festive preparations and performances could dispel. As Taft's inaugural ceremonies in 1908 were overwhelmed by a March blizzard of unprecedented proportions, so this latest inaugural occasion was overwhelmed by an economic storm of like character. On the very day, almost the hour of Mr. Roosevelt's entrance upon the presidential office, the supreme crisis of the depression seemed to break. The sudden death of Senator Walsh, the new president's ablest adviser, came as a kind of premonition of disaster. Then, on March 4th itself, came the nation-wide closing of the banks to save the country, momentarily at least, from the final catastrophe of complete economic collapse. When Mr. Roosevelt lifted his hand and voice to take the oath of office, he confronted such a situation as America had not seen since Abraham Lincoln took the same oath in 1861. What will happen—has happened before these words can be read—the Editor cannot foresee. The difficulty of editing a weekly paper at more than a week's distance from the publication office was never so apparent as in such times as these when event follows upon event with lightning-like rapidity. Suffice it to say, since so little can be known at this moment of writing, that Mr. Roosevelt's inaugural address was an utterance well-calculated to stir and reassure a people on the verge of panic. The new President unhesitatingly assumed leadership and definitely promised action. The most sensational passage in his address, of course, was the threat of dictatorial powers in case of failure on the part of the duly authorized instrumentalities of government to accomplish results. Mr. Roosevelt at least knows, or seems to know, that the economic structure is cracking up and breaking down, and that nothing but heroic measures can save it. What *are* those measures? For disclosures of them we must wait—and we propose to wait as patiently and open-mindedly as may be possible. The new President should have his fair, free chance to show what he can do. But let him hurry. Time presses, and the old system gets more hopeless every hour.

What the banking situation will be in this country when this editorial is read, no man can say. The closing of the nation's banks by official proclamation—an exact duplication of what took place in Germany two years ago—was sensational and probably necessary, but also lamentable. Certainly the new President fulfilled the promise of "action" as stated in his inaugural address. But bank holidays are no solution of a bad bank situation, as Mr. Roosevelt himself recognized in summoning Congress into immediate session for legislation bearing on the present terrific situation. His program of reform is a matter of enormous interest and importance, for change must be drastic. When it is remembered that between five and six thousand banks in this country have failed since the depression started, and that the national moratorium had to be declared in order to prevent universal collapse, it is evident that something is wrong with banking here as compared with other countries. The difference is not a matter of law. It is a matter of idea, or principle, or character. In England, or in Canada, bankers regard it as their primary function to protect the interests of their depositors and to serve the welfare of the community. A bank is a semi-public institution organized not to make profit for anybody, but to conduct safely and wisely the finances of the people. In this country, *per contra,* a bank is a form of private business, operated primarily for the profit of the officers and the stockholders. It is like a department store, or a manufacturing concern, or a mining corporation—a device for making money, with the depositors furnishing the capital and the organizers making the money. In recent years this business, like most business in America, has become a huge gambling enterprise. Banking today is just a "racket," that's all! Senator Wheeler, of Montana, knew what he was saying when he named Al Capone in the same sentence with "these crooked bank presidents." In the light

of the facts, we cannot for the life of us see why people should put their money in banks. The government sells bonds and receives savings. Why not use the government, and thus make banking what it should be, one of the functions of government?

O, Bryan, Bryan, thou shouldst be living at this hour! This is not the first time, as our readers will testify, that we have broken instinctively into this exclamation. Again and again, during the terrific crises of these last three years, we have inevitably had our mind thrown back to the prophecies of the late Nebraskan as events have one by one returned the nation to his policies and principles as the way of escape from disaster. Thus, Bryan sought to destroy the gold standard—just a generation before the gold standard disappeared in every country of the world except France and the United States! How long, now, will it last here? Bryan was all for silver coinage—and the last Congress within a month, under the leadership of Senator Wheeler, took the first steps toward this action. Bryan was an outstanding champion of the government ownership of railroads—and the railroads today, under the tender ministrations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which is steadily granting loans destined never to be repaid, are moving straight and sure to this denouement. Bryan always advocated the government guarantee of bank deposits —and here was this very policy suggested by great and conservative leaders, within a few hours of the inauguration, as the sole means of saving the country from collapse. Bryan consistently fought for the independence of the Philippines—and this independence was granted in this last session of the last Congress. What all this means it is impossible now to say. It may be that the adoption of Bryan's crazy notions, as they were regarded in his day, simply signifies desperate measures which are destined to stand as milestones on the road to ruin. It may be that Bryan was a wiser, sounder, greater statesman than he was ever credited with being in his lifetime. It may be that, as an unflinching democrat close to the popular movements of his day, he felt currents and tendencies, in the mystic prophetic sense, which were never disclosed to abler and better instructed men. Whatever the final verdict of history, the life and thought of William Jennings Bryan will henceforth be judged in the light of all that has transpired since. This fact will add immeasurably to the stature of his interest and importance as an historical figure. Strange indeed are the whirligigs of time!

The National City Bank scandal takes its place with the Kreuger and Insull scandals. How many more gigantic sensations of this kind are coming along to convince the populace that business and banking are one huge game for the swindling of the people! Look at what was done in the case of this second largest bank in the world! In 1929, just after the big crash, the officers of the Bank loaned to themselves the sum of $2,400,000 to enable them to "carry on" with their commitments for the purchase of stock of the institution while their personal finances were jeopardized. This loan was made without interest to some one hundred officers, and only 5 per cent of it has been repaid to date. At the same time humble clerks of the bank, who had been driven to purchasing bank-stock at 200 and 220 a share, lest they lose the favor of their superiors, were given no help at all after the crash, and are at this moment making payments as best they can in stock now worth less than 30. The head of the bank, Charles E. Mitchell, was paid in bonuses in 1927, '28 and '29, in addition to his annual salary of $25,000, the sum of $3,500,000—which gives him a salary for these three years of nearly $1,200,000 a year! In 1929, this costly man, Mr. Mitchell, sold to a member of his family 18,000 shares of his National City Bank stock at a loss of nearly $2,800,000, which enabled him to escape paying any income tax that year. At the same time the bank got rid of $31,000,000 of worthless Cuban sugar paper by a feat of jugglery too complicated and clever to describe here; sold its own stock "short" in the boom market of 1929; and disposed of millions of dollars of Peruvian bonds to a trusting public at a time when it had definite information that Peru's finances were unsound and the bonds therefore a bad investment. What all this means in terms of morals we know, and in terms of law we hope the government will find out. Meanwhile, we content ourselves at the moment with stating our conviction that the business life of this country, like its politics, is rotten through and through. Mr. Mitchell is no exception; he is one of the leaders of the gang.

The electoral triumph of Hitler on March 5th last is a final exposé of the confusion of our American press. For nearly two years, now, it was apparent to any competent observer that the German Republic was disappearing and the Nazi leader moving to the swift and terrible mastery of the Reich. We have prophesied this steadily here in UNITY. But our newspapers would not have it so. Every time he increased his vote in successive elections, our press insisted that this was the last crest of the wave, and that the flood must now recede. When, in the November election, his vote *did* recede, for reasons not at all difficult to understand, it was proclaimed that Hitler's end was at hand. When at last he swept into power as the Chancellor, the newspapers declared that the event had no significance. But now, when all is over, and the Nazis are as completely in control of Germany as the Fascists of Italy, there is nothing more to be said. Our Amer-

ican newspapers have collapsed, and concede what was so easy to foresee when the Hitler star first began its rise in a stormy sky. The *Herald-Tribune* (New York) even confesses that the silliest of all journalistic fairy-tales—that Hindenburg has appointed Hitler to the chancellory in order to trap him in a conservative cabinet—was a fairy-tale indeed. Thus,

> Hitler, instead of being "the prisoner of the Cabinet," as some observers thought when President von Hindenburg appointed him Chancellor on January 30, by virtue of yesterday's election has become the boss of the government, and the "fine people"—Hugenberg, Von Papen and Von Neurath—if they continue to remain in the government will do so at the Chancellor's sufferance.

Let it not be thought that we are exulting over Hitler's victory. On the contrary, we are terrified in the thought that the most direful event in Europe since the Versailles Treaty now throws the continent into a sort of ultimate chaos of violence and hate. But we believe in facing reality. For months now this reality in the European situation has been the rise of Hitler; for months to come this reality will be the ascendency of Hitler. With the Reichstag now in his control, he can dismiss it forthwith and rule in his own exclusive name and power. That he will do this, and in so doing consolidate his power, and then proceed to put into effect his ferocious policies, is reasonably sure. Not since the War has the European sky been so dark.

The New York *Evening Post,* in something of a panic, wants to know "what does the future hold" in the light of recent sensational action by students of Oxford, England. We don't wonder that the dear old journalistic lady is terribly perturbed. For a few weeks ago the Oxford Union, a famous student organization representing the best brains of the University, traditionally the men destined to sit in the Commons and lead the Empire, voted by an impressive majority of 275 to 153 "that this house will in no circumstances fight for its King and country." This is a sensational utterance, spoken not as a snap-judgment but after the sober and prolonged debate traditionally characteristic of the Oxford Union. The *Evening Post* does its best to minimize the seriousness and significance of the action, seeking comfort in the thought that "it is not necessarily true that the 275 supporters of the motion believe in it unequivocally"—or will act upon it unequivocally, we might add! But, even so, this journal has to concede that "it cannot be denied that radicalism of a Socialist-pacifist stamp has won control of the Union." Just so! Now see how the spark, once kindled, lights a conflagration! On the very day the *Evening Post* editorialized lugubriously, it printed in its news columns the following despatch:

> MANCHESTER, England, March 3 (AP).—The Union of Manchester University today followed the lead of the Oxford Union by passing, 371 to 196, a motion "that this house will under no circumstances fight for its King and country."

This was followed in turn by another report from Oxford to the effect that "in a tumultuous meeting, the Union rejected by a vote of 753 to 138 a motion to expunge from the records the previous motion declaring that 'this house will under no circumstances fight for its King and country'." In the face of performances of this kind on the part of the best young men of England, the future rulers of the country, we do not wonder that there appears the question, "what does the future hold?" For ourselves we think, in the light of these events above noted, that it holds everything of promise for a better, safer, and happier world. We would not exaggerate the importance of any isolated happening anywhere, but this action of enlightened English students stirs our blood. Peace may come in time, after all!

Community Politics

Demos is and will remain a mob, incapable of self-direction, if political leadership will have it so. Yet demos will rule. We would as well make up our minds to that. Wildly, brutally, or in orderly fashion and to constructive ends, the mass will rule or ruin. We are in for democracy. Incidentally it may be added that we ought to be glad of it. We are far too inclined to take the fact cynically. Is not an assumption of popular incompetency the making of the political party? A group thinks itself to be more capable of managing the affairs of the community than is the whole people. Political parties wish to rule; they do not desire that the people shall rule. Should not discussion start with an overhauling of the fundamental conception of party and party government?

Partisanship has brought itself into such disrepute that few or none have a word openly to advance in its defense. Yet we continue to operate the politics of the community by parties, and most proposals for reform of the notoriously evil condition of party politics look to the formation of new parties to redeem us from the mischief wrought by the old. Does not protracted experience raise the question as to whether democracy can ever be made efficient under the party system, old parties or new parties, bad parties or "good" parties? Can there be a good political party? Is not the proposal that the affairs of the community shall be managed by a group, however superior its personnel, an affront to the democratic sense?

The issues of government center upon two functions: first, the determination of policies, and, second, the administration of the practical affairs of the community within the requirements of the policies determined upon. The former function is exceedingly im-

portant; also the demand for its exercise is very limited. In not a half a dozen instances is the determination of policies called for during the entire session of a Congress or other legislative body. The fuss and fury which attend the meeting of these bodies is in most instances merely the sparring of groups for partisan advantage. The shaping of statutes under established policies is a purely technical process. The administration of the statutes shaped by this process is again a purely technical matter. The whole people is easily capable of determining all of the policies required for the orderly and just conduct of government, and that with the employment of very simple machinery. In any case, no single group is competent to do it for the whole people. The genius of democracy requires that the people shall discharge this function, whatever be their decisions, wise or otherwise. Adequate machinery for recording their decisions will vindicate their essential wisdom. If the technical processes of codifying statutes and administering laws were in the charge of persons trained for their parts, and if they were freed from all inducements to do aught but play their parts honestly and efficiently, nine-tenths of our present political woes would automatically disappear. A few experts, chosen because they are skilled in legislation, would go immeasurably farther in vindicating the genius of democracy than can all of our legislatures and congresses as now motivated.

Starting with these elementary propositions it ought not to be difficult to construct the political machinery required to discharge efficiently the functions of government. So far as the former of the two primal functions is concerned, namely, that of determining policies, we have for a long time been stumbling into a practicable regimen. At every election now, the whole roster of voters is asked to pass upon one or more propositions designed to determine legislative action. A slight extension of this process, and more intelligent educational campaigns in advance of the vote, would remove all need or excuse for political initiative in our legislative bodies.

After all, the chief menace to free institutions does not lie here. Our laws may need to be improved, but we already have far better laws than we use. American government fails, not in the determination of policies, but in the execution of laws and in administrative honesty and efficiency. It is immeasurably more important that we have honest and efficient public officers than that a group of us wise ones should get together and decide upon policies of government. We already have a surfeit of these wise groups propounding their saving measures. Their wisdom is bootless so long as it remains the superior possession of a group. A party to propagate measures of government is the very frustration of the end sought. Party measures are not the will of the whole people, and no law is safe or righteous which fails to express that whole will.

In organizing anew for political action should not the prime objective be, therefore, the nomination and election of competent officers of government? It might be demonstrated, I think, that much of our present muddling springs from the attempt to combine in the same organization the two primal functions of citizenship mentioned, namely, that of selecting governmental officers and that of promoting policies of government.

If our present procedure were not so familiar it would seem little short of idiotic. For the most part we wait for the individual citizen to present himself for the office to be filled. If not that, we wait for him to be thrust forward by a partisan group who choose him because he is known to be serviceable in furthering party ends. Then we throw upon the candidate himself the onus of getting elected. He must lay aside all considerations of modesty and the standards of taste which prevail in other relationships, while he shamelessly exploits himself. He must give his own time and usually spend considerable money on the chance that he may win the election. If he wins it is usually after a hot personal encounter with one or more opponents. The reward of all this strenuous effort is a meager salary, or such gratification of personal pride as accompanies public office. Or, is this all? Does not the system breed other motives which must be kept under cover, perquisites which are not named in the contract, emoluments which it is not good form to discuss in the open? The system under which we install our public officers inspires, almost compels the corruption which we so loudly denounce.

Moreover, we exact of these candidates pronouncements in advance upon the policies which they will uphold. They harangue us interminably, airing their political opinions, telling us what far-reaching reforms they will effect, how they will put through improved measures of government. Then, at once we have elected them, we bind each under solemn oath that he will strictly observe and undeviatingly administer the laws as they actually exist. That is to say, to fulfil their campaign promises our officers of government must violate their oaths of office. This is not a mere accident in isolated cases; it is a fixed system under which we conduct our politics.

In a few instances, but in very few indeed, it makes a difference what are the personal politics of an officer of government. Most notably true is this of the President of the republic. His office at times compels him to exercise certain political duties. But these duties are in large measure, even in the case of the President, thrust upon him by popular insistence rather than by the genius or the constitutional requirements

of his office. In almost no other office is there responsibility for political initiative, or the choice between this or that policy. The law determines the duties of public officers, and his oath of office compels each to hold within the prescriptions of law. To effect the reforms which he glowingly promises before election he must violate this oath. Is it any wonder that there is so much evasion and duplicity in public office? We, the people, deliberately create the conditions out of which these political vices must proceed; we require our governmental officers to be shifty and venal.

The cure of these conditions? Is it not plainly the putting of persons in office who are chosen not for their commitment to certain policies but for their executive competency? We should have an organization of "disinterested" citizens who will accurately appraise the requirements for efficiency in each office, and will carefully select persons capable of and willing to discharge its duties. The sole question to be asked of the "candidate" should be "Are you willing to accept this office if you are elected to it?" Once having answered that question affirmatively the candidate should go fishing until after election day. At any rate, he should be nowhere involved in the process by which he is elected. He should not only not be asked to contribute effort and money but he should not be permitted to do so; the attempt on his part to further his candidacy should be esteemed disqualification for the office. He should not be a member of the nominating organization, or if he chances to be a member before his nomination, he should resign and sever all relationships with the "party." No pre-election promises should be exacted of him, nor should he be permitted to make any. His oath of office is the only promise which should be expected of him. His executive competency should be determined by an independent appraisal of his talents, his training, his experience and his personality.

The process by which the nominating organization arrives at its conclusions should be fully revealed. The business of the "party" is to answer the voters' question, "Why should this man be put into office?" The answer must show how the duties of the office have been appraised and how the candidate measures up to them. This cannot be done efficiently if the nominating organization is also a policy-shaping body, and is guided in its statements by the conformity of the candidate's political opinions with the political opinions of the "party." This organization should therefore resolutely eliminate political considerations. It should have no politics. That is to say, the shaping of public policy should be no part of the business of this "party." To allow politics to mix in must frustrate the central aim of the organization.

There is no reason why this movement should not be inaugurated at once and anywhere, no reason why this "party" should not be organized wherever there is a group of enlightened citizens ready to try it. Its success will require organization and money. Research and investigation of the records of candidates will involve expense. It will cost money to inform the voters of the qualifications of the candidates. But the motive for the effort and for the expenditure of money can only be community service. It will be to the interest of every member of the "party" to push its program because he will profit by the benefits accruing to the whole community. No member of the organization stands to profit at the expense of other citizens. No sinister, anti-social motive can enter.

Can such a "party" succeed? Will the motives which are alone permissible be sufficiently potent to make the organization go? The only way to find out is to try. This "party" will come into sharp competition with parties which now control our politics. But this competition cannot control for long if the new organization will remain true to its principles and stay on the job. The electorate will not be long in deciding between candidates chosen as now proposed and the political hacks who are thrust forward by political parties generally. After all, the test will lie in the motivation of political activity. Can an organization survive which exists exclusively to serve the community, or must our political leadership be permanently lodged with groups whose primary interests are those of the group itself, and which seeks only secondarily or very remotely the good of the community as a whole? It is time we tested this alternative thoroughly.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

How easy it is to close banks! How simple to safeguard deposits by denying to depositors the right to draw their money! But the problem, gentlemen, is to keep banks open, and to give depositors their money when they want it. Solve that!

How appropriate that, at just this time, a depth has been found in the ocean greater by several miles than any ever known before! Obviously, this is just what we need for the depression.

Governor Lehman, of New York, partook of a six-cent charity luncheon the other day, and expressed himself as well satisfied. Now let the Governor eat this luncheon every day, and perhaps the only meal each day—then see how he likes it!

What is the greatest curse that ever befell the human race? We answer—*the invention of fire-arms!* If there are those who think us wrong, let them name one other thing that has done more to endanger man's life, wreck his happiness, and menace his future.

The Louisville and Nashville Railroad is planning to cut down its passenger rates to 2 cents a mile. This would seem to indicate that there are really some brains left in the railroad business! Perhaps, if the managers are sensible enough to reduce rates, they will also be sensible enough to run a few trains and thus make travel the convenience it used to be instead of the aggravation it now is.

Lieut.-Col. Richard Stockton, in his recent book, "Inevitable War," speaks of disarmament conferences as *"conferences where nations fight for strategic advantages in the wars to come."* We mark the Colonel 100 per cent for a perfect statement. J. H. H.

Religion in Modern Life—and Afterwards

The modern critical spirit has been directed with special vehemence against religion. True, skepticism is as old as human thought. But the promulgation of the scientifically based doctrine of evolution took the controversy of religion out of the realm of argument into one in which science demanded, not arguments, but demonstration that could be subjected to laboratory testing. This was exceedingly awkward for religion. It could not produce a soul for examination by the new inquisition. Hence, scientifically, there was no such thing as a soul. That and other similar tests finished revealed religion.

But religion did not seem to realize that it was finished. It had gone on existing for as long as skepticism had existed, and did not see why it should break the habit. And today, while the doctrine of evolution, in the nineteenth century sense, is getting a good many jolts, religion is being cheered by the recognition of science that, bearing in mind a number of considerations that will emerge in what here follows, while creeds which do not permit themselves to be interpreted and which demand acceptance of the letter of their statement, may or may not fail, religion as an expression of the emotional nature of humanity cannot fail.

Touching, for example, the God-feeling in human aspiration, Sir Oliver Lodge, in an article on "Science and God," notes humanity's early infantile ideas regarding a Supreme Being. The idea of "God" is still growing, says the scientist; and, bearing on the idea, he continues, science has given the world certain findings that are "important theologically:" viz: that law and order are universally operative, consistent and obeyed; that one system of laws governs all universes. Thus, Sir Oliver summarizes, there is "one majestic reality," and all things material, mental and spiritual, are part of it.

Sir James Jeans, the astronomer, in his book, "The Mysterious Universe," thus summarizes the progress of scientific thought along a line that converges towards the religious line:

> Thirty years ago we thought, or assumed, that we were heading towards an ultimate reality of a mechanical kind. . . . Today there is a wide measure of agreement, which on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading towards a non-mechanical reality; the universe begins to look more like a great thought than a great machine. . . . The laws which nature obeys are less suggestive of those which a machine obeys in its motion than of those which a musician obeys in writing a fugue, or a poet in composing a sonnet. Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter. . . .

He asserts that the mathematical explanation of the universe is nearer reality than the mechanistic and biological explanation.

Albert Einstein, the mathematician, takes up his parable, and says, in an article on "Religion and Science:" "In primitive peoples it is fear that awakens religious ideas," and fear creates an external being on whom the fearful depend. . . The rise of the social instinct develops a social or moral idea of God. But Einstein recognizes a third aspect of religious development, "the cosmic religious sense;" having no anthromorphic deity; realizing the nobility and order in nature and the world of thought; feeling "the individual destiny as an imprisonment;" seeking to "experience the totality of existence as a unity full of significance." He sees this cosmic element in the Psalms, the Prophets, and particularly in Buddhism, as expounded by Schopenhauer.

> How (asks Einstein) can this cosmic religious experience be communicated from man to man, if it cannot lead to a definite conception of God or to a theology? It seems to me that the most important function of art and of science is to arouse and keep alive this feeling in those who are receptive. . . . Science . . . . has been accused of undermining morals, but wrongly. The ethical behaviour of man is better based on sympathy, education and social relationships, and requires no support from religion.

The focusing of attention by these three scientists on the central life of the universe and its reflection in the religions, indicates their realization of the crucial nature of the intuition of God in religion. Rabindranath Tagore, philosopher-poet, reflector and creator, says, in his "Letters to a Friend:"

> Preachers and ministers of religions have made it their business to deal with God at every moment. They cannot afford to wait until they come in touch with him. They dare not acknowledge the fact that they have not done so. Therefore they have to strain their minds into a constant attitude of God-knowingness.. . And yet the consciousness of God, like that of other ideas, comes to us only with intense moments of illumination, of inspiration. If we do not have the patience to wait for it, we only choke the path of inspiration with the *debris* of our conscious efforts. Those who make it their business to preach God, preach creeds. They lose their sense of distinction between these two. Therefore their religion does not bring peace into this world, but conflict. . . The losing of Paradise is enacted over and over again by the children of Adam and Eve. We clothe our souls with messages and doctrines, and lose the touch of the great life in the naked breast of Nature.

Two aspects of "God" are indicated in the foregoing statements of three scientists and a philosopher-poet: (1) as the total life of the cosmos, within which manifestation occurs under inherent laws; a life which the human consciousness can contact under the identi-

fying terms of One Reality, Creative Mind, Cosmic Consciousness, or God; (2) as an expression of a growing idea in the history of religions.

Einstein, in his reference to the development of the idea of God, takes the nineteenth century rationalist view of its being only a creation of the human imagination. But Lodge's One Reality (which naturally includes all phases within that Reality), and Jeans's Creative Mind place the initiative of life beyond the limitations of life, and give us the formula that *the progressive idea of God seen in the religions was man's progressive reaction to a reality.* This reality he expressed in terms of his own nature, era and environment. Einstein does the same. He condemns the idea of a God who rewards and punishes. Looked at not on the flat but in the round (that is, not literally, but figuratively), is such an idea any less scientific than that of a cosmic life of law that must be obeyed otherwise suffering ensues? Is not a non-anthropomorphic deity just as inadequate as an anthropomorphic one? Is Einstein's dualistic sense of a limitation of life, and a struggle towards totality, different in *essence* from the struggle of the pious to have union with God?

Both ideas, I told, are less than truth. If the One Reality is accepted, there is no question of struggle. The union is there already. The Vedantic assertion, "I am That," states both the Reality and the technique of realization: the drawing of the individual consciousness away from transitory details towards the center round which they evolve; or, stated otherwise (and all such statements are figurative expressions of states of consciousness), from fragments towards the totality in which they inhere. That is what Tagore means by cessation of straining the *mind* towards God-knowingness: all that is needed is acceptance of the normal fact of the identity of Life. The strain towards artificial God-knowingness producing efforts beyond the normal, gives rise to religions, hence conflicts of technique; whereas the spontaneous touch of the Great Life brings peace.

Tagore's Edenic paraphrase gives the imaginative artist's clue to the true approach to scripture: by way of the creative imagination and poetry. The flat statement that "God created man in his image" reduces a colossal process to puerility in front of geological and astronomical history. But it takes on a different guise when it is read in the round as proclaiming the emergence of the phenomenon, Man, as part of the One Reality, and therefore partaking of the characteristics of the One Reality. Seen in the round, also, that other statement that Man has made his gods in his own image, with its nineteenth century implication that God therefore has no existence, becomes a statement that Man's explanation of the Reality to himself is in terms of his own nature, which nature is part of the Reality; that "God" and "Man" are therefore reciprocal terms, mutual analogues. The characteristics that man attributes to God are the characteristics of God-in-man. And between the totality, God, and the item, Man, stands the creation of both, the Christ, who uttered, not a creedal dogma but a universal verity, when he called Himself both Son of God and Son of Man.

Apart from historical elements, all scriptures are symbolical presentations of various aspects of the One Reality. They are works of art. They have anticipated Einstein's declaration that "the most important function of art" (also of science, he says) "is to keep alive this feeling" (cosmic consciousness) "in those who are receptive." The scriptures (all of them, not only the Psalms and the Prophets, that is, the poets) are essentially true because they are imaginative responses to universal verity. But, as works of creative imagination, they demand interpretation, not as between text and text, or text and context, but as between outer expression and inner significance. This process is not an attractive one to the occidental mind, which is mainly realistic; that is, fixes its attention on limited mental and emotional phases of its own response to the Reality —and calls that realism! With the oriental mind it is different. It does not take the symbol as Reality; neither does it take it, as the occidental mind does, for factuality.

Einstein's conjunction of cosmic consciousness with science and art is an interesting disclosure of the mixture of orient and occident in his nature. As an offspring of the oriental race to whom came the declaration: "Hear, O Israel! the Lord thy God is one God!" he feels the touch of the Parabrahman (beyond creation) of India. But there was this distinction between the two responses to reality, that, while the Aryan genius accepted the "One God" as a *unity,* hence *en rapport* with its own parts, the Semitic genius treated it as a *unit,* hence separate from its creation. In his desire for unity Einstein shares the spirit of the dualistic *yogis* of India. But they turn inwards in contemplation in order to unify themselves with the One Reality; while he limits the means for arousing and communicating cosmic consciousness to the two out-turned directions of the emotional and mental aspects of the human consciousness, art and science.

Yet the oriental in Einstein does not let him rest in a completely external activity. His "art" has hovering over it the wings of consecration out of which the imagination created the angelic hosts and the religions; and his "science" has behind it the feeling that cried: "When I *consider* the work of Thy hands . . . " out of which have come the philosophies of mankind. Religion is, indeed, the upturned and inturned emotional nature of humanity, and the completion of art: philosophy is the upturned and inturned mental nature of humanity, and the completion of science.

Einstein dissociates religion from ethical behavior. It is probably a fact that no religious code has produced a true ethical code. Neither has any ethical code produced a true ethical organization of human relationships. In the matter of tangible results, ethics has nothing to boast of over religion. Either, fully applied to life (the Ethics of Confucius or the Sermon on the Mount), would have made humanity human and civilization civil ages ago. Yet, Einstein's prescription of sympathy, education and social relationships would be worthless unless it were a conscious effort to develop in human nature and action some latent elements in its participation in the nature of the One Reality. A sentimental sympathy will fade out; but sympathy that reflects the integrative principle in the cosmos will last. Education is useless at present because it is not expanded to the full nature of the student as an epitome of the creative, reflective, observative, expressive and aspirational phases of the cosmic life. Social relationships today are anarchic because they are not coordinated with the realization of human variety as atomisings of the One Body of Reality. Seen thus, Einstein's prescription of sympathy, education and social relationship is essentially religious as conforming with

aspects of the One Reality. It will also conform with the religions when they become religious.

The defect of religion up to now has been its attempt to dominate the whole of human experience through one faculty of its sensorium, the emotional. The defect of nineteenth century science was its attempt to subject vital experience to the test of a single aspect of human endowment, the analytical. The demand now of a mechanized hasty outer life to dominate the contemplative necessity by the dynamic necessity is equally defective. Yet these attempts at domination were signs of a true movement in human progress; not a movement towards domination of the whole of life by any one or two of its phases, but of a future free interaction of all phases of human endowment; in short, a movement towards synthesis. Religion has particularly felt the interference which is the first crude form of subsequent interaction. It has been challenged by philosophy, even so long ago as the time of the Caesar of the Gallic War who said that those who studied philosophy did not worship gods—and, in the saying himself gave the intellect the place of divinity. Centuries later Francis Bacon filled out Caesar's dictum by pointing out that, while the *superficial* study of philosophy led to a-theism, deeper study led to religion. The challenge of religion by science has passed from the superficial state, and is leading science itself curiously near to religion; for science has passed in a generation from the merely physical to the superphysical, and has for some time been busy in restoring to grace some "religious superstitions" which late last century it boasted of having exploded, such, for example, as the functioning of the human consciousness without its customary instruments—and all the implications that hang thereon.

When the process of interaction is sufficiently advanced, the religions will have become religious, and the religion of the future will have begun to emerge. Its intuitional assumptions, mental illumination and emotional expansions will have been pondered by philosophy, tested by science, expressed by art, incorporated in life. And these processes, which will hasten each other the more closely the synthetical movement brings them together, will not only have acted beneficially on religion, but will themselves have undergone

> "a sea-change
> Into something new and strange."

The influence of religion will have melted the frigidities of philosophy into fructifying streams for the lowlands of life: it will have given science a heart, and rid it of the overgrowths of expert ignorance fertilized by cruelty, which have stifled the growth of true knowledge: it will have liberated art from the enslaving inflammation of sensation into the free inspiration of spiritual vision and creative imagination. After that, it will reach the synthesis, the simplicity of wholeness, the "cosmic religious sense," the instantaneous identification of itself with the "One Majestic Reality," and with the "creator and governor of the realm of matter;" and from that center of consciousness will act as what Chuantze, the commentator on the teachings of Laotze (300 B. C.), calls "the delegated image of God," through a life that is the "delegated harmony (synthesis) of God." "Man, one immortal soul of many a soul," will, through aspiration, express, not as heretofore, creedal limitations of the One Reality, but the plenitude of the Cosmic Love; through the arts the Cosmic Beauty; through the philosophies the Cosmic Order; through the sciences the Cosmic Law; and these —Love, Beauty, Order, Law, Man will fulfill in the action and organization of daily life which will express the Cosmic Process and Goodness.

And then there will be no need to write articles on religion in life ancient or modern, for life will itself be religion.

JAMES H. COUSINS.

Fallacy in the Liquor Argument

Being neither a political prohibitionist nor a drinker or "wet," I think my mind is free to apply reasoning to this rushing action for bringing back the liquor trade. The economic argument in favor of drinking is sheer nonsense; drinking is not a productive business. No people ever drank itself into prosperity. Drinking will not create or make anything except what useless consumption always tends to make, namely, pauperism. The only argument for liquor that is logical is the argument of personal liberty; the right to do a certain thing whether it hurts or helps the doer, and providing it does not hurt other people too much. Whether liquor-liberty can be justified under this rule, it is not necessary here to say. We only mean to say that this is the only rule of logic that can justify it at all.

But a word about the false notion that the making and drinking of liquor will increase "prosperity!" They say that because it is to be made from grain and other farm produce, it will increase demand for such basic materials and so increase employment. That sounds reasonable until we reflect that in this machine-made unemployment with which we are burdened, there is not enough money to buy the *necessary products* of farm produce—like bread and meat. Bread is also made from grain, and if the people have no money to buy bread, a greater necessity than liquor, where will they get money to "stimulate" grain-production by buying whiskey, which is less necessary than bread? If the wants and desires of the people could work out, they would work out through the necessaries of life. It has not been shown that the people will be any more able to buy the less necessary than the more necessary. What the weak ones will do, will be to divide their present poor purchasing power between the necessaries and the tempting luxuries and so make their health worse and make conditions worse.

Why add more terribly tempting wants, when the people are unable to supply their present necessary and very oppressive wants? That is the question for real statesmen. Catch-vote politicians care not for such reasoning. It is both common sense and economic science, as well as experience, that the drinking of liquor does not put more money into the drinkers' pockets with which to buy meat and bread and clothes.

Another specious argument is that the clandestine sale and purchase and consumption of liquors has increased the disposition of the people, especially of the young, toward crime. There is no proof of this. It is more reasonable to conclude that post-war psychology and the "rebellion" of the rising generation was absolutely independent of the liquor limitation, and that in fact the ban on liquor helped to confine the possible extremes of that rebellion. It can be logically reasoned thus: If the modern spirit caused such liquor excesses

when liquor was hard and dangerous to get and mostly poison after it was gotten, what might have been the condition if liquor had been easily accessible and without terrors during that post-war decade? Our girls, instead of staggering around in petting parties might have been lying around drunk in saloons and gutters.

Also, the development of gangs and rackets is not necessarily a consequence of the legal limitations laid on liquor,—even if it can be shown that illegal liquor traffic offered the racket spirit an exceptional opportunity. Racketeers and gangsters have been busy with many other social and economic relations besides liquor business. We can as well understand that gangsters, like rebellious youth, are the inevitable result of the loss of respect for all things sacred or customary, which was engendered by the mad war and the dishonest politics that accompanied the war and the "treaties." "Force" was deified; cunning and daring were raised in relative value; and our old pioneer spirit and "freedom" of competition and "respect for the winner" made good soil in which gangdom could flourish.

The argument to legalize liquor simply because there will be some illegal traffic in the goods, is every bit as logical as an argument to legalize and tax murder and robbery, because there still is and is still likely to be a great deal of it. Bank robbery, too, could be legalized and taxed, and maybe some of the killing done away with by making it a bit less dangerous and less disgraceful to the bank robber. And the state and national governments could prosper by sticking on a very high tax, anywhere under one hundred percent, against the robber's takings. That would tend to civilize, regulate and control the robbery business. They might complain a bit, like the rest of us, against the high taxes.

WILLIAM PICKENS.

To-day's Money-makers

In an article recently published in the New York *Times* we are told that during the last decade the armament firms of the world have increased their dividends five hundred per cent. The makers of guns and munitions are making fortunes, while the makers of flour and shoes and most useful articles are making no dividends but are mourning over deficits. Lord Robert Cecil declares:

> There is a very sinister feature in all the disarmament discussions. I refer to the tremendous power wielded against the disarmament proposals by the armament firms. It is no longer safe to keep in private hands the construction of these terrible instruments of death.

At the conference on The Cause and Cure of War which has just closed in Washington, special attention was given to "War Provoking Influences of the Manufacture of Armaments." The eleven national women's organizations represented, which number many million members and which have departments devoted to international friendship and world organization, have studied many phases of the causes of international disputes and are convinced that one serious cause of the great appropriations for armaments, which has not lessened since the Paris Pact to renounce war as a national policy, is due to the subtle influence and control over newspapers, especially in France, of the armament firms, which can silence even where they do not corrupt editors or proprietors.

A valuable little pamphlet, entitled "The Truth About War Makers," written by Lieut. Colonel George A. Drew, of Canada, reveals in startling fashion, not only the machinations of our American Shearer, which many already have quite forgotten, but the colossal mischief by the so-called "man of mystery," Zaharoff, who is a Greek, born in Anatolia in 1849, and now living in Paris. Abnormally shrewd and clever in silently working to get the famous armament makers in different countries under his control, he became, as Col. Drew puts it, "the super-Shearer of all time." Through Vickers he controlled armament companies in Italy, Russia, Spain, Japan and Canada. He had substantial holdings in the Schneider-Creusot Company in France. Through his associates he was shareholder in Krupps, also in the Skoda gun factory where Germany made her mighty howitzers. When the war came, he was a mysterious figure of almost unbelievable power. He became the confidant of Lloyd George; throughout the war his power continually increased. In 1917, when there was some discussion of advisability of peace negotiations through the United States and President Wilson hoped for a "peace without victory," this armament maker, who had interests on both sides, "was consulted by the small group of men who decided the issue." The British ambassador at Paris records that "Zaharoff is all for continuing the war *jusqu'au bout;* a lame peace would cause squabbles between the Entente Allies." So those who were clamoring for "a fight to a finish" eagerly sought the entrance of the United States into the war, though up to the time that we went in only fourteen Americans going on American vessels had been killed. In 1916 a Belgian Senator said to me: "I hope the war will end in a draw; because if it ends in a draw, both sides will see the futility of force; but if one side is trimumphant and the other crushed, both sides will continue to believe in force." This is precisely what happened. If there could have been a negotiated peace, and this might have been but for the influence of armament makers, millions of lives and many billions of dollars might have been saved and the bitter aftermath of war, even though the depression has also other causes, might not have laid its burden on the rising generation.

The Shearer episode may profitably be recalled. When, after propaganda in the "patriotic societies" and the public generally, Mr. Shearer went to the naval conference at Geneva in 1927, well financed by men who had desired its failure, he largely succeeded in satisfying them. After his return he brought suit for over $200,000 against certain armament firms for failure to pay him. This led to an investigation by President Hoover and the temporary retirement of Mr. Shearer into innocuous desuetude.

"The vitally essential list" of things for use in the World War, either manufactured or purchased, numbered 4,000. Not merely the makers of guns, but of many other things, are interested in having huge war appropriations. This is the time for paying taxes; and it is well for tax payers to know that we are paying largely for "prestige" and not for genuine defense against attack by foreigners. It is startling to know that the world is now spending more on war preparations than it did in 1913 on the eve of the "war to end war." We are the sponsors of the Paris Peace Pact, now signed by sixty nations, renouncing war and

pledging peaceful settlement of all international disputes. There are now adequate means for such settlement of all possible disputes. A clear corollary of this is complete provision of instrumentalities for legal and peaceful settlements in the rapid and radical reduction of these instruments of war. This we must imperatively demand. We must immediately demand the prohibition of the export of all armaments and munitions by any country to any other country. We are just witnessing the gross evils springing from neglect of this prohibition as regards Japan and China, and Bolivia and Paraguay. The evil is scandalous, a flagrant violation of the spirit and the letter of our solemn international agreements, and should be stopped completely at once.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

The Study Table

Power and the Public

There has been a great deal of discussion in recent years on the subject of the power trust. Is there or is there not a power trust? Men like Senator Norris of Nebraska, Senator Walsh of Montana, and Governor Pinchot answer the question in the affirmative, while Mr. Martin J. Insull says, or rather did say, that the power trust is a myth. Mr. Insull has been supported by a multitude of witnesses.

In 1927 Senator Walsh introduced a resolution for the investigation of public utilities into the United States Senate. This resolution was acted upon the following year but instead of investigation being carried on by the Senate it was shifted to the Federal Trade Commission. Hearings were begun by the commission and are still being held. The results of these hearings have been published in forty-four volumes. Carl D. Thompson, Secretary of the Public Ownership League of America, has made a summary of the voluminous testimony taken by the Commission and embodied it in a book which he significantly calls "Confessions of the Power Trust."* The book is little more than selected bits of testimony given by representatives of the public utility corporations.

The significant thing in these "Confessions" is not the revelation of greed for power or the willingness to make the public pay for all that it can be compelled to pay for the service rendered by these utilities, or even the enormous growth of the intricate organization of the utilities companies but rather the revelation of a lack of honor, of a sense of decency, of fairness. There seems to be no sportsmanship in the conduct of public utilities. Business seems to be largely a matter of "knock 'em down and drag 'em out." Rules of the game—there are none. Anything goes. When dealing with the public appeal to reason is scoffed at. Appeal to prejudice is considered the up-to-date method for influencing public opinion. In short, it is not the economic side of the "Confessions" that disturbs the reader but the ethical side. The story from beginning to end is one in which men reveal their willingness to use the ethics of war in the conduct of their business. Their God is Mars rather than Minerva. The letters of the agents of the National Electric Light Association are amazing reading. These letters written to fellow workers are confessions that in their public capacity they are deliberately engaged in deceiving the public. They admit to one another that the rates are too high in privately owned plants, that municipal plants legitimately undersell private plants and that the latter are heavily over-capitalized. One agent who publicly condemns public ownership in most extreme terms privately writes:

> Possession of property breeds liars and cowards. The man who invented private ownership was a mortal enemy of the human race.

Another utility man wrote, and the letter is on record:

> The thing about the utility industry that disgusts me is the lying, trimming, faking and downright evasion of trust that marks progress toward enormous wealth of some of the so-called big men of the industry. When I see some of these fellows *waving the flag* (italics ours) I am filled not only with disgust but rage, for they are anything but patriots.

Another of these agents writes:

> Been to bed but can't sleep—some of these times I'm going to get a piece of soft pine and a sharp knife and whittle out a conscience that will let me sleep when other people do.

These "Confessions" are a revelation of an utter lack of a sense of trusteeship. They are another evidence of what an acquisitive society will do to ordinary human folk. It is not that these people are essentially bad people. Probably they are not. They are people who have gone mad under the pressure of the temptation to acquire great wealth quickly. When one thinks of the failure of the Insull Companies and the Foshay Companies it seems as though we had not advanced much beyond the days of the South Sea Bubble.

Each of the sixty-eight chapters in the "Confessions" deals with a separate phase of the activities of the Power Trust, but in none of these is there any revelation of the sense of responsibility to the public as a primary duty on the part of the officials of the utility corporations. Space will not permit any detailed account of the methods used to prevent the development of municipal ownership in America. The organization of holding companies has been for the alleged purpose of increasing economy and efficiency, but as a matter of fact these "Confessions" demonstrate that the purpose of these companies has been to exploit both the consumer of power and the private investor. The inflations of capital through these holding companies reach astronomical proportions. The "writeup" of capital stock in individual companies reaches unbelievable figures. Three to one seems to be a very modest amount. Occasionally, a prominent official is revealed as protesting against this financial orgy. Samuel Furgeson, President of the Hartford Electric Light Company, is quoted as saying:

> I know of no more reprehensible abuse than for speculators to buy up companies for high prices, put them into a holding company and then, by trading upon the credulity of the investing public relative to *claimed increases in economy* (italics ours) to unload the holding company's securities at advanced prices, and then get completely out from under before the bubble is punctured, leaving the unfortunate investor face to face with an angry consumer.

Unfortunately this is the ordinary procedure that is carried on in reference to utility corporations.

The dividends that have been paid are almost unbelievable and yet they are recorded in the "Confessions." "Never in the history of the human race has the progress of mankind paid such returns." So runs

---

*"Confessions of the Power Trust," by Carl D. Thompson. Public Ownership League of America, Chicago. Price $5.00.

the report of the National Electric Light Association.

By stock manipulations enormous earnings have been, in the past, secured. Dividends of from 15 to 100 per cent seem to have been fairly normal. The highest dividends that were reported gave a return to the Electrical Bond and Share Company, in 1927, of 3,102 62/100 per cent. The salary paid to officers for manipulating this Aladdin's lamp has been, of course, commensurate with the dividends paid. Mr. Foshay, whose company has since failed, received in salary and bonuses one year $306,000.

From the standpoint of economics the record of the managers of these utility corporations is one of wild, insane plunging. In the manipulations by which the vast holding companies were organized there seems to be nothing short of murder that is not revealed to the Commission. Even so, we read the threat that certain men ought to be stood up against the wall and shot.

Possibly there is nothing sadder in the whole record than the story of the corruption of public school teachers and college professors. It arouses the readers' indignation when he discovers how the power companies have censored text books dealing with economic and social subjects in our schools and colleges. Censorship of any sort is bad enough but we may pray the Lord to deliver us from the hands of men who secretly confess that what they publicly do is infamous. Such men will go to lengths that will bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of an honest crook. One of the most amusing "Confessions" was made by Mr. Robert Roy McGregor, assistant director of the Illinois Commission on Public Utilities Information. It occurs in the course of an examination by Judge Healy. Mr. McGregor reads from a letter which he had written to a friend who wanted to know how to meet an opponent who favored public ownership, the following: "My idea would be not to try logic or reason but to try to pin the Bolshevism idea on my opponent."

It was almost one hundred years ago that Carlyle thundered at the aristocracy of England. In shrill trumpet tones he told them explicitly that they had failed and were through. These "Confessions" call for a new Carlyle to announce to these captains of industry that they, too, have failed.

After reading this book at least one thing can be said for public ownership, which the officers of public utility companies so bitterly oppose. There has been no wild, insane speculation in the stocks of publicly owned utilities simply because there are no stocks in which to speculate.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

The Peaceful Redskin

The author of this book*—her Indian name is Yehsennohwehs!—is a sympathetic and thorough student of the life of the natives who inhabited this continent before the arrival of the white man. She has studied their history, and gone deeply into their lore and customs, and understands their genius. Thus is she qualified to reveal the Indians, as they were mistakenly called, in their ways of peace as well as of war, and to surprise us perhaps with the declaration that these so-called "savages" were in many respects a peaceful and law-abiding folk. She reminds us, for example, of the union of the Five Nations (later the Six Nations) in the state of New York in the sixteenth century "to stop for all time the shedding of blood by violence, and by means of laws of justice, brotherhood, and common well-being to establish peace," and calls this not inaccurately "the founding of the first league of nations."

The most familiar story of peace among the Indians of the American continent is of course that of the Great Treaty of 1682 between the inhabitants of Pennsylvania and the people of William Penn. This story of the Quakers and their Indian friends is well told in this book, but it is only one of several such tales. For there were other treaties, and other periods of peace, between white men and red. Had not greed and aggression and what Miss Powers well describes as "the superiority complex" of the Europeans done their perfect work, there might not have been these dreadful wars of extermination which stain the course of history. For the Indians had their methods of securing peace, their peace-pipes and wampum belts. If they went upon the war-path it was after all in defense of what they regarded as their own.

Miss Powers' study is adequate and authentic. She tells forgotten narratives of Indian history, and remembers noble chieftains who ruled wisely in the interests of amity. Especially valuable and attractive is a closing chapter of peace legends and stories. "Unlike the white man who builds monuments and sets up tablets at every cross-road announcing that he has been there, the Indian," says Miss Powers, "cooperates with and loses himself in a landscape. . . . While the Indian did not build a great material civilization as have Americans today, nevertheless he has built into the etheric consciousness of this continent a spiritual structure that is almost beyond compare." This "structure" has its halls of peace. In describing them, the author has made a unique contribution to the peace literature of our day.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*"The Indian As Peacemaker," by Mabel Powers. Published by Revell. $2.00.

Only Yesterday

Long awaited, painstakingly prepared, eagerly read, the fourth volume* of Mr. Sullivan's ornate album at last is on the market. As in the case of the first three, it is marked by capital writing, sound research, and penetrating judgment, plus a power of visualizing an epoch so as to give it the reality of a photograph: it is marred, unfortunately, for all its humor, by an over-sentimental seriousness, manifested principally in far too many ponderous pedantic footnotes. These flaws, however, are only very evident in the beginning; and, on the whole, the book is a worthy companion to its three illustrious predecessors.

Prefaced with an attractive colorato entitled *The Dawning,* which shows slumbering America only faintly troubled by the trumpets of Sarajevo, the album, page by page, picture by picture, unfolds those glamorous pre-war years that saw the rise of Ford; the genesis of scientific industry; the gift-extravaganzas of Carnegie; the transformation of the English tongue; the Witches' Sabbath of rag-time; the Gargantuan growth of the cinema; the Armageddon of Taft and Roosevelt; the Jacobinism of La Follette; the Machiavellianism of Carranza. And (as in some medieval Book of Hours) along the margin runs in

*Our Times, IV, The War Begins: 1909-1914. By Mark Sullivan. Scribners, $3.50.

intricate profusion a flowered fantasy of old songs, old jokes, old cartoons—the whole constituting both an unexampled entertainment and an invaluable contribution to the literature of the period. For, despite his occasional banality, despite his tedious enumeration of trivia, despite his tendency to take his America too seriously, Mr. Sullivan's four volumes are a monument of historical creation; and their reception may perhaps be taken as evidence of the truth of a tradition that, whenever a nation ceases to make history, it begins for the first time to read it.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Correspondence

Technocracy in the Balance

Editor of UNITY:

Mr. Edmund B. Chaffee, in UNITY for February 27, has a very readable article on Technocracy's Warning, which he concludes as follows: "Some of the illustrative figures may have to be modified, but the case as a whole seems unassailable. . . . By learning the secret of using mechanical power we have stolen the very fire of the gods. With it we can relieve humanity of practically all burdensome labor. But . . . we can also burn our civilization to a crisp. This is Technocracy's warning."

Are we in such a morally purposeless universe, one so blind to fine ethical and social values, that we can for a moment admit our helplessness in the face of our conquests of nature? It would seem the more successful we become in cooperating with the latent forces God has spread out before us, the more certain it is that we are hell bent in our conquests. Can we admit that humanity is so stupid that it will go on experimenting till it burns itself up? Are we to learn nothing from our experiments that we may turn to our well-being? Are we so insensible to the pangs of progress that we are doomed to destruction? Is it safe for us to be allowed to make explorations farther?

If I thought our free agency had nothing other ahead for us than the possibility of such a catastrophe, I would cease to be a prophet of progress and turn cynic at once.

I cannot believe that the ways of God with men are so past finding out that we are left to darkness and despair. I cannot believe that our free agency, and thirst to explore, were handed to us to scorch us to a crisp if we made a mis-step. On the other hand, I also believe that whatsoever we sow that shall we also reap. We shall have to take the consequences of our fool deeds and learn from bitter experience the way of life everlasting. With so much of a preachment, let us turn to this thing called Technocracy to see what terror it holds for us.

Let us modestly admit that we do not know all there is to be known on this bogey man, and if we did it would be impossible to use it all in this article and accomplish our purpose. And let us further admit that the task is not an easy one to compass in a brief article. But we have set the limits and to that we adhere.

We are in a revolution, no doubt. Things are moving too rapidly to call it merely evolution; but if we take ourselves in hand we may hold on to the red thread of evolution which, if held, points the way to a fuller life. And that is the subsumed fact in all liberal prophesying. Life, the abundant life, is the goal. We need not, we must not stand with empty heads, nerveless hands and impotent will. And it is possible to see even further unfolding of our conquests of nature under the order that has brought us to the present possibility for the abundant life, for even the flowering of the life that all hope for.

The process of improvement has always been going on. The application of animal power, and the power of the wind, and water power, and gravity runs back to the times no one knows. The present application of steam, electricity, and the internal combustion engine are different mostly in that they have got a jump on them compared to the application of animal and water power to the production of goods. More power is being used than formerly, but no new principle has been introduced, especially economic or social principle. Right here is where we must get a firm grip on our thought. Which antedates the other, economic principle or mechanical appliance? Did the steam engine make possible the birth of self-interest in supplying our wants, or did the supplying of our need bring forth the steam engine? Which comes first, the economic principle or the mechanical device?

Let us admit that the introduction of power machinery to the production of goods has always supplanted human energy and there has always been some criticism of the machine that threw men out of their jobs. And we will also agree that it has been a great gain to the individual and to the race that such has been the case, for by the absorption of the displaced workers in other forms of industry, the one sure condition for progress has been established. But some say we have reached the limit. Men can no more be reabsorbed in new forms of industry, for there are none.

Therefore, we must abolish the machine. We must go back to hand craft production. Everyone is entitled to a job, without a doubt, but must we smash the machine to get that job? Let us see who are out of jobs just now and why they are not absorbed in some form of gainful employment. The criticism is that the machine has thrown laborers out of employment. Very well. Merchants, salesmen, accountants, lawyers, ministers, teachers, statisticians, bookkeepers, clerks, engineers, brakemen, conductors, artists, and an army of white collar workers to boot are looking for jobs just now. What machine has thrown them on the street? We can see how coal miners are too numerous, and farmers are too many. The machine has done them a nasty turn, we say. But the vast majority who want work never ran a machine and could not be displaced by machine industry at their tasks. We can readily see how the farmer, by using gas for horse power, has done away with the hay crop that he used to sell to feed horses in the city and elsewhere. And we can easily see the miner's plight. And we can see also how wearing silk instead of cotton has hit the cotton grower. But to charge the machine with all the mischief is not scientific. So we must look elsewhere for our trouble.

So many of the displaced laborers are unable to slip back into other forms of industry that we must look to another factor to learn why. Industry is carried on largely on faith and credit. Just now, credit is a pretty scarce article, and faith is hoodwinked mostly. It may be that human nature should not want what it wants, but want what it needs to make itself robust in social values, but the fact remains that it expects rewards for the effort that it puts forth. And with the division of labor that has taken place and the system of exchange by means of a medium called money, civilization has made mighty strides. Can we save what underlies this system for the new day that is about to come or must we throw it to the winds, as the Technocrats tell us we must or die?

Lest we fail at this juncture to see what is involved, let us ask who are supplanted by the machine and cannot compete successfully in the game. Not the list cited above surely. But those only who have muscle to sell, or energy of muscle and dexterity of hand to sell. This it is that the machine displaces, not mental activity. Those who do things that machines cannot do escape competition with the machine and are greatly benefited by machine production.

Those who would set aside our wage system, and ignore the great gain that inheres in the division of labor, must somehow fail to see that only manual laborers are in competition with the machine. Then if it is narrowed down to those only who have muscle power and manual dexterity to sell who must be accounted for in our adjustment of the future, suppose we keep the wage system for a while yet and meanwhile develop a new viewpoint in education, a new outlook on life. Might we not be able to use the appeal to the desire for reward in our effort if we had a new social outlook, a new race consciousness, a new sense of solidarity; in short, a downright faith in the universal Brotherhood of Man? Admitting that free enterprise and individual initiative may be the driving force in much of the progress of the past, must they always be self-centered to the hurt of the masses? Must the capitalistic system be thrown into the junk heap just because it has failed to do everything it might have done? And

are we sure that the proposed substitute without a new spiritual view of life would be of any advantage?

To be more specific, since those who sell muscle power and manual dexterity are the especial members of our social body that must be provided for in the new adjustment, should we not strive to equip such members of our social body with other aptitudes and capacities so they would not be at the mercy of the soulless machine that produces so much more cheaply than they can? If civilization is at stake and any particular class (I hate the word class) has to be changed, let us change the rabbit breeder class for the better. Surely we will not order the future of civilization on the basis of the proletariat that has but one recommendation to its credit—muscle power. Democracy and progress flourish only where individualism is a real force in life. We have been regaled with a lot of fun at President Hoover's use of the phrase rugged individualism. And we must remember that any social body that lacked in its members that ruggedness would be a pretty flabby affair. What we are bound to introduce into our social economy is soul power for the individual. That may mean the taking over as a social function the limiting of births to the proletariat class. If there were no more "muscle men" than could find sale for muscle only, we would not have any competition between machine power and muscle power. Or if those who are only able to compete with the machine could be enlarged so as to enjoy other activities and interests than now engage their spare time, it would be some gain to the race and certainly to themselves.

What is equally desirable is to educate men to want the things they ought to have, and we shall be obliged to fall back on human nature as it is to start the ball rolling that way. We shall have to use value to move men tomorrow as we did yesterday. If four days' labor on a ten pound stickpin cannot be sold, it must be because no one puts any value on a ten pound stickpin. Motive plays a big part in all human relations. And any economic system that does not play up that fact cannot get itself accepted. And equally so the greater the motivation that any economic system has, the better it works.

Hence we need to study deeply to be sure we save all that capitalism has used to bring about the progress thus far made in civilization. And just as surely do we need to discover why we are in the bog of depression. If we can charge up to a wasteful war the piling up of immeasurable debts; if we can see how involving one's self with obligations beyond one's power to meet; if the wild scramble for an unsocial advantage entails disaster in the nature of the ethical enterprise we call civilization, I think we ought not to go any farther for reasons for our stagnation in the pursuit of the natural commerce that goes on normally among nations and peoples. No, the machine is not to blame for our under-consumption of goods and the maladjustment between nations. Our false views of life have been at the bottom of the trouble. To hit upon the one thing that has characterized man in his greatest successes in life as the cause of his distress is unscientific.

This is no defense of capitalism as such. Capitalism may have to go; but when it goes, it will go up higher. The great gains it has brought about are invaluable to civilization and may not be lightly thrown away. It can be improved, will be improved; but when human nature takes a new lease on life that improvement will come.

There is much that remains still to be said on this topic before we have seen through it north and south, east and west.

But do not charge against it the results of man's wild and immoral orgies in lust and hate. Let us keep a clear eye and an honest, unflinching facing of facts in our survey of all such topics.

Hop Bottom, Pennsylvania. CHARLES E. PETTY.

Inflation

Editor of UNITY:

Regarding an editorial in UNITY of Feb. 27, which deals with the subject of monetary inflation, I wish to dissent in a way. Please understand at the outset that I am not an advocate of inflation. I am also too careful and too thorough a student of economics to hope or expect any real betterment of conditions through any such easy short-cut as tinkering with the currency. The point I wish to make is that deflation is as bad as inflation, and there seems to be a report about that there has been considerable deflating going on of late. Just how this has been effected I am not prepared to state, but the value of the dollar has immensely risen, to the great injury of the debtor class, especially the farmer. Some may object and say that the deflation is the result of hoarding in these hard times, but it came at an earlier period as I remember. There is nothing to show that the government called in or destroyed any money. There is another body which could possibly do this—the Federal Reserve Bank. I must confess ignorance of the powers and operation of this body. I have tried to inform myself, but instead of information could find nothing but propaganda for the system, so, as was quite natural under the circumstances, quit the search full of suspicion. The bank's oft-repeated boast that there could be no more panics was, however, the beginning of my prejudice.

An utterance of Lincoln shortly before his death is of interest in this connection. The Civil War was scarcely over when financial leaders started an agitation to retire the greenbacks. Lincoln objected, saying that to retire the greenbacks before paying off the government debt *"would be a crime against the people."* The bond holders had purchased their bonds in cheap money; the bonds should be redeemed in the same money. Only a short while after Lincoln's death the destruction of the greenbacks started.

The editorial goes on to disparage the use of silver. Here I would like to object, for there is much to be said in favor of bi-metallism. One metal is much more easy cornered and controlled than two. The editorial makes the familiar assumption that silver is as cheap and abundant as lead, an old saw of the financial powers. Given a natural and steady demand and would not silver function as well as gold? The experience during centuries of the past is that they were a good working team. However, I must not attempt to go into this now for lack of space. The matter of the price of silver is complicated by the question of economic rent, one of the most difficult of economic questions. This is why the public has never understood it. Still one last word: why is it that the financial powers have so persistently fought silver? Think on this.

I hope you will pardon the crudities and asperities of this hasty message; I have little time for letter writing.

New Paltz, New York. ALFRED B. BLAKE.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 34)

the kindly neighbor, the generous friend.

He loved outward nature, especially the spring and the sunshine, as those know who have talked with him in his own beautiful garden, gay and scented with flowers, and with the little summer house, where he wrote when weather and season allowed.

He loved all the animal creation, with the passion of a Saint Francis, especially his horses and dogs, and to telephone him before 9:30 any morning in Hampstead was to hear he was out early with his devoted dogs on the Heath.

He was a great humanitarian, giving personal energy and sympathy, the force of his pen, the persuasiveness of his speech and also money, to all causes which were for peace and internationalism or justice, and his heart literally bled for those who were the victims of the War, the despised and rejected of men, whether in prison or suffering from hunger and poverty.

He always had a soft spot in his heart for Hungary, and when I was at home in London each summer, he was always eager for my visits to tell him about the conditions out here. He rejoiced over any changes for the better, but always asked pertinent questions about the distress and poverty in this great city. When I was at his house in the middle of October—the last time I saw him—he showed his keen and genuine interest in your poor, and committed to my charge a sum of money for relieving a little of the urgent need and hunger of the winter.

The Soup Kitchen organized at *Mátyás tér 2* with the kindly help of the Salvation Army workers, and which has already fed about 200 poor people daily with soup and bread, during the months of December and January, and will continue till the end of March, is the gift of our friend, John Galsworthy—the friend, too, of a group of your city's poor. In this Soup Kitchen and in the photographs sent to him, he took a great delight

and interest, and was happy it had been so undertaken. Recently he wrote to me, "I am glad to think, that the money is doing some good." He wanted no publicity for his action, but in such deeds one felt the simple charm of his kind heart.

In the recent difficulties and also the triumphs of the Hungarian P E N Club he showed deep concern and spoke much with me in October about its future and especially he delighted to recall those happy days spent here as your guest.

Recently Mrs. Galsworthy sent me a volume of his poems saying how "very underrated they were, probably crowded out by novels and plays." Reading them one finds the deep religious faith of our departed friend.

We shall miss his earthly presence, but he will live in the hearts of his reading public as a writer of pure and noble literature, and in the hearts of his personal friends as a lofty and Christlike soul. We can only thank God for the beauty and goodness of his life.

FREDERICK HANKINSON.

Budapest, Hungary.

British Churchmen Aroused

"We are profoundly impressed by the visible abundance of the world's actual wealth of supplies—the gifts with which God in his bounty has so richly endowed us. We refuse to believe that, where material resources and technical skill exist in such plenty, it is past man's wit or zeal so to adjust the distribution of that wealth as to satisfy true human needs. *The situation is a challenge for the reconsideration of existing theories and practice in economics and finance, and of the artificial barriers which prevent the exchange of goods between the nations.*" These are the conclusions reached by the (British) Council of Christian Ministers, of which the Bishop of Lichfield and Dr. Scott Lidgett, president of the Methodist Church, are joint chairmen. The Council has issued a statement on the present economic distress, signed by thirty Church of England representatives (including ten bishops), and leading representatives of the Nonconformist Churches. The above conclusions are contained in the statement, and the following are further extracts: "There is a moral obligation on all Christian people, in view of the grave failure of present economic practice, to re-examine their standard of values and their attitude towards material wealth, and on all economists and financiers to re-examine accepted theories in the light of present realities. *We are also convinced that no mere attempt to restore the conditions of the past can be successful, nor, if it were to succeed, would it be satisfactory. Our social life has to be rebuilt, and for that rebuilding account must be taken of the difference to the whole system of employment which mechanical improvements and scientific discoveries haev made.*" On the day on which the above statement appeared in the press (January 5), there was also a report of the opening of the Student Christian Movement Conference at Edinburgh with a paper by Canon F. R. Barry, Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford. He, too, uttered an indictment of the present system in the following emphatic terms: *"While the world slips down from chaos to catastrophe we sit and starve in the midst of plenty, content with the economics of Bedlam, not because any sane man believes in them, but for sheer lack of faith in anything else."*

—*The World Tomorrow.*

A Story of Emerson

In "Emerson the Wisest American," Philip Russell tells this story:

"It happened to be Emerson's fifty-ninth birthday, part of which he spent pottering around the barnyard with his son Edward. Before he returned to the house, he decided to put the calf into its stall. The calf, a big heifer, resisted with that calm obstinacy which has often filled otherwise kindly owners of animals with vindictive red thoughts. The son grasped an ear, the father pushed diligently from behind, and together they tried to propel the animal into the barn. Emerson hated being heated like this; he often complained that outdoor activities drugged a scholar and unfitted him for his proper tasks; but he was not the man to forsake an undertaking once begun, and again he put his weight behind the animal. The heifer remained firm, rolling the whites of her eyes and breathing out through her moist nostrils a milky but stubborn odor.

"Emerson paused and gazed upon the animal in bewilderment. The situation was unprecedented. He had read the philosophy of Plato and Plotinus, the science of Newton and Bacon, the poetry of Hafiz and Herbert, the teachings of Buddha and Confucius, the histories of Plutarch and the Sieur de Joinville, the memoirs of Goethe and Napoleon; only recently he had been through the Etudes de la Nature of Saint-Pierre; but none of them had said anything about an effective and harmonious method of pushing a female calf into a barn. Emerson had no physical strength and sometimes lamented that he lacked that commanding presence which awes with an eye, a word; but one merit he possessed in abundance—persistence.

"He therefore gave an encouraging signal to Edward, and once more they fell upon the animal. The heifer planted her splay feet and remained as before. The pale face of the sage reddened and perspiring beads gathered upon his high forehead. And then an Irish servant girl came by. With an amused glance she thrust a finger into the animal's mouth, and the calf, seduced by this maternal imitation, at once followed her into the barn. Edward looked at his father and grinned; but Emerson was already absorbed in thought, his eyes fixed musingly upon the ground. He returned to the house, and after cleansing his hands of their hairy, bovine smell, recorded the incident in his journal, adding this telling declaration: 'I like people who can do things.'"

—The *Christian Leader.*

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

IMPORTANT!!!!

The March-April issue of

The New Humanist

includes the following significant articles, reviews and poetry

WHAT IS HUMANISM?
John H. Dietrich

PHILOSOPHY AND SHIRT-SLEEVES
Max C. Otto

RELIGION IN VARIOUS CULTURES
A. Eustace Haydon

THE UNIQUENESS OF MAN
Raymond B. Bragg

HUMANISM STATES ITS CASE
Edwin H. Wilson

A MAVERICK PSYCHOLOGIST
Maynard Shipley

THE CASE OF MR. BABBITT
Carl H. Grabo

THE EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY
Oliver L. Reiser

THRUSH CLEAR
Julia N. Budlong

To neglect the New Humanist is to fail to keep abreast of the most important trends of modern thought.

Single Copy 20c Yearly $1.00
Foreign $1.25

105 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois